Navy Corrections Program Evaluation Review: Phase I Review of Findings

Kimberly P. Whittam, Ph.D.

20040706 075

June 2004

Navy Corrections Program Evaluation Review: Phase I Review of Findings

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Kimberly P. Whittam, Ph.D.

Reviewed and Approved by
Paul Rosenfeld, Ph.D.
Acting Director, Institute for Organizational Assessment

Released by
David L. Alderton, Ph.D.
Director

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology Department
Navy Personnel Command
5720 Integrity Drive
Millington, Tennessee 38055-1000
www.nprst.navy.mil

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*
06-30-2004	Technical Note	1-1-02 to 12-31-02

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
Navy Corrections Program Evaluation Review: Phase I Review of Findings	
	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
Kimberly P. Whittam	
	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology (NPRST) 5720 Integrity Drive Millington, TN 38055-1400	NPRST-TN-04-5

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
Navy Personnel Command Corrections and Programs Division 5720 Integrity Drive Millington, TN 38055	PERS-68
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

A - Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

The Navy Correction Program evaluation system has been in place for approximately 10 years, and in that time there have been numerous program changes. This report presents a current review of the evaluation system. Overall, the findings were encouraging. The correctional facilities largely report being in compliance with the evaluation program. A review of the on-going analyses reveals that the majority are being conducted in the same manner. The report also presents areas for improvement. For example, scales currently in use need to be re-validated to ensure they are still relevant and useful. Further, the original evaluation plan called for advanced data mining of the evaluation data, but because of other constraints, such as the huge amount of labor that must be expended to calculate recidivism, in-depth data mining has not been occurring. The report presents possible means of addressing these issues, as well as areas for future research.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

Navy Corrections Program, Program Evaluation, Evaluation

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Rhonda Patton
UNCLAS	UNCLAS	UNCLAS	UNLIMITED	22	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER *(Include area code)* 901-874-4994 (DSN 882)

Foreword

This effort was funded by Corrections and Programs Division (PERS-68) of the Navy Personnel Command. The objective of this study was to document evaluation activities being conducted at the correctional facilities and the analysis of that data. These findings represent the first phase in a review of the corrections program evaluation.

This report is intended for the leadership of PERS-68 and may also be of use to others interested in the evaluation of correctional programs. The author wishes to thank the funding sponsor for their help and the staff of the correctional facilities who provided information on their facilities.

DAVID L. ALDERTON, Ph.D.
Director

Summary

The Navy Correction Program evaluation system has been in place for approximately ten years, and in that time there have been numerous program changes. This report presents a current review of the evaluation system. The primary goals of this review were to:

- identify current evaluation activities

- identify changes in the evaluation program, as compared to the original evaluation program

- identify preliminary areas for improvement and make recommendations for future program evaluation activities

Overall, the findings were encouraging. The correctional facilities largely report being in compliance with the evaluation program. A review of the on-going analyses reveals that the majority are being conducted in the same manner.

The review did find some areas for improvement. For example, scales currently in use need to be re-validated to ensure they are still relevant and useful. Further, the original evaluation plan called for advanced data mining of the evaluation data, but because of other constraints, such as the huge amount of labor that must be expended to calculate recidivism, in-depth data mining has not been occurring. The report presents possible means of addressing these issues, as well as areas for future research.

Contents

Introduction

In the early 1990s, a comprehensive evaluation program to assess the effectiveness of the Navy Corrections Program was developed and implemented by Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) (see Kerce, 1989; Kerce & Magnusson, 1992; Kerce, Magnusson, & Rudolph, 1994). The prior NPRDC efforts are documented in three reports that are available on-line at http://www.nprst.navy.mil/ResearchSearch.htm. This evaluation program consisted of the following measures:

Prisoner Personality Inventory and Evaluation Survey (PINES)

Purpose: Measure personality traits and social psychological attitudes of correctional facility prisoners, and to assess attitudinal change as a result of rehabilitative programs. Dimensions assessed: self-esteem; internal vs. external locus of control; feelings of anomia or isolation; and several value dimensions.

Administration: Detainees/prisoners complete measure during orientation (PINES A) and just prior to release, typically 3 to 5 days before release (PINES B).

Life History Form

Purpose: Standardize the collection of narrative information from the prisoners across correctional facilities and for use in research purposes (e.g., correlating demographic information from the Life History Form with outcome data).

Administration: Completed by detainees and prisoners during orientation.

Responsible Service Member Scale (Responsible Sailor Scale)

Purpose: Scale used by staff members as part of the classification process. It rates an individual on dimensions thought to be qualities important to a responsible service member, such as "hard worker," "neat, military appearance," and "dependable." Changes in scores may also be related to outcome data for program evaluation.

Administration: Completed by correctional facility staff three different times during the prisoner's stay (orientation, upon move to general housing (approximately 10 days after initial entry), and prior to release). During each administration of the form, two different staff members are to evaluate the prisoner using this form.

Pre-release Questionnaire

Purpose: Provide an opportunity for prisoners to express their opinion about the program elements and staff members.

Administration: Completed by the prisoner prior to release.

Program Summary Form

Purpose: Document the types of programs (treatment and training) that the prisoner completed while confined to the correctional facility. This information could then be used in

combination with other data, such as the pre-release questionnaire and recidivism data, to evaluate the success of the programs.

Administration: Completed by the correctional facility staff prior to release.

Corrections Staff Data Questionnaire

Purpose: Assess corrections staff on five dimensions: Positive Regard, Capacity for Change, Negative Regard, Treatment Sub-scale, and Punitive Sub-scale. It has been shown that staff attributes have an effect on outcomes of corrections programs. Data could be used to assess staff changes over time and to correlate these changes with prisoner ratings of staff (from the pre-release questionnaire).

Administration: Measure is to be administered three times: upon arrival to the training academy, prior to leaving the training academy, and prior to rotating out of the correctional facility to the next assignment.

Correctional Custody Unit (CCU) Command Follow-up

Purpose: Individuals assigned to a CCU as a result of a Non-Judicial Punishment (NJP). These individuals are personnel who have discipline problems and are less than satisfactory performers, but who are also judged by their Command Officer (CO) to have the potential to complete their enlistment in a satisfactory manner. Those detained in the Correctional Custody Units (CCU) are returned to the active duty fleet, which provides a unique opportunity to assess their performance after release from the CCU.

Administration: The Commanding Officer of the unit to which the Sailor is returned is sent a questionnaire regarding the performance of the individual, to be returned to the CCU.

These measures provide data that are not limited to straightforward analysis, such as counts of the self-reported number of behavior changes, but can also be used to investigate potentially complex relationships. These analyses may further explain and clarify determinants of success within the program (such as relating the number of self-reported behavior changes with factors reported on the Life History Form, satisfaction with programs, and ratings of staff helpfulness).

Since the development and implementation of the evaluation program, there have been numerous changes within the program—from number of facilities, to changes in personnel and even other Navy-wide changes, such as the downsizing of the military in the mid-1990s. After any major program changes and the minor changes that occur with the passage of time, there is a need to re-evaluate the state of the evaluation program. Such a re-evaluation typically occurs in the following phases: (1) documentation of current practices so they may be compared/contrasted to originally intended practices, (2) critical evaluation of current system (e.g., re-evaluating the psychometric properties of the scales currently used) and development of recommended evaluation plan, and (3) implementation of the revised evaluation plan. This report addresses the first phase of this re-evaluation: determining and documenting currently practiced evaluation activities.

This report is organized as follows: The first section will cover the methodology used to determine current evaluation activities. The second section will review the findings, from a description of the evaluation activities currently being performed to a review of the analysis

currently being used. The final section will present the discussion and recommendations from this phase.

Methods

The basic method of collecting information for this phase involved discussion with three main groups: (1) PERS-84 (headquarters) staff, (2) correctional facility staff, and (3) the manager of the program evaluation, Mr. Chuck King at the Miramar Consolidated Brig.

Meetings with the staff of PERS-84 included discussions regarding:

- Data needed
- Reports they currently receive
- Areas of concern (for example, recidivism calculations)

For the correctional facility staff, questions/topics were:

- Description of the data collection process
- Data maintenance
- Types of data analysis/information useful to their operation
- Obstacles in the current evaluation process
- Suggestions for improvement

A copy of the questions used to guide the discussions can be found in Appendix A. Staff at the correctional facility in Yokosuka were contacted via e-mail and fax, given that the time difference made a phone interview difficult.

Finally, the Miramar Consolidated Brig was visited for discussions with Mr. King, the manager of the evaluation program. Topics for discussion were:

- Data received from the Correctional Custody Unit (CCU) and brigs
- How data are entered (scanned, hand-entered, etc.)
- How data are maintained
- Data linking/tracking
- Types of analysis conducted with the data
- Length of time data are maintained
- Obstacles in the current evaluation process
- Suggestions for improvement

Additionally, while at Miramar, discussions were held with persons actually involved in the collection of the data, to better understand their processes, obstacles, and concerns (questions used to guide the discussions are included in Appendix A).

Findings

This section presents the major findings of the review of the evaluation analysis. These findings have been organized into eight major categories, which discuss not only the current evaluation activities, but also differences between the original plan and the current analysis activities. It is important to note that, by and large, the base elements of the evaluation appear to be conducted as they were previously. There have been, though, changes that are noteworthy.

Evaluation Activities at Each Correctional Facility

One of the most critical elements to this review is the establishment of what evaluation activities are currently being implemented by each facility. Appendix B contains a table highlighting the use of the various evaluation measures by facility. Overall, the reported use of evaluation activities is remarkably consistent with the intended approach. There were some noted differences—for example, one facility reported that two staff members complete each Responsible Service Member (RSM) scale, yet they record only one. That modification was made when they discovered that the second RSM rater (typically the block supervisor) was giving everyone "4s" and "5s" because the second raters felt they did not know enough to provide a rating. Therefore, the correctional facility altered the plan. Two raters complete the form, but the Receiving and Orientation (R&O) supervisor enters only one score. If there are areas in which the raters disagree, the R&O supervisor works with the Block supervisor to reach consensus before entering.

Other correctional facilities report keeping both paper forms of RSM and entering the data into the Correctional Management Information System (CORMIS) mostly as a matter of convenience—not all of their staff have access to a computer and CORMIS, so the counselor enters in the data for both into CORMIS. Others reported they were only keeping paper versions of the form and are not entering the data into CORMIS. One reported neither sending the paper form to Miramar nor entering it into CORMIS.[1] Another key difference was that the Corrections Staff Data questionnaire was not consistently administered. Many admitted that it simply was not completed because it was too easy to miss staff when they rotated out of the assignment. Two facilities appeared to give the Corrections Staff Data questionnaire when the staff first arrived, and one of those two facilities reported administering the questionnaire again when the staff left.

These sorts of changes and modification to the program are not unexpected, nor are they necessarily detrimental to the program. For example, as one brig found the information provided by the second rater of the RSM was typically not helpful, it would be worthwhile to look at the data and assess agreement between raters and the typical distribution of scores by the raters.

One current need is to verify the correctional facilities' self-reported evaluation activities with actual data. In other words, are two RSMs really being completed for each administration? Are they being completed for everyone at the facility or a small proportion of the facility? Currently, data are reported on number of forms received, but additional data are needed to place those numbers in context (such as percentage of entering detainees/awardees for whom the

---

[1] It should be noted that when this evaluation was being conducted, CORMIS was just being implemented by the different facilities, so it is not surprising that there was not uniform entry of the data into CORMIS. It would be expected that over time, use of CORMIS would increase.

PINES A was completed). The contextual numbers should also be cleaned, so that they represent the correct population. For example, persons who enter the correctional facility should receive an initial RSM, but if they remain for less than eight days, they would not be expected to have a second and third RSM. Therefore, those persons should be excluded from the sample when calculating compliance as the percentage of persons who should have received a form.

Standard Analysis

From the review of the reports (quarterly, yearly, and special reports), it appears that the analyses currently run are the same as the basic analyses originally developed. Mr. King reports using the computer program that was originally developed by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC), including the statistical software syntax and procedures for cleaning the data, a critical step for this evaluation given the complexity and volume of data. A review of the actual syntax indicates that it follows the original guidelines established by NPRDC, and should ensure consistency in reporting across time.

Some analyses are being conducted that were not specifically suggested by NPRDC, and for which there are no syntax files. These are typically analyses run for special reports, such as looking at specific relationships between variables (e.g., differences in ratings between individual brigs and their programs.). Unfortunately, neither the procedures run on that data (i.e., the syntax files that direct the analysis) nor the output files generated by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were reportedly kept. Therefore, any verification of those analyses or data is not possible. It is recommended that these analyses, both the syntax and the output, be kept for at least a year. This would serve multiple purposes: (1) ensure that repeated analyses are conducted in the same fashion, (2) provide documentation about how data were handled, and (3) if additional analyses are needed, provide an analysis syntax that can be modified for new analyses, again ensuring that follow-on analyses are conducted in the same manner as previous analyses.

Limited Use of the PINES by the Correctional Facilities

The Navy Corrections Program Evaluation as originally developed was much more than an outcome-only assessment of program impact. The PINES, specifically, was developed to provide valuable information to the correctional facilities and their counselors regarding their detainees/awardees. Initially validated on a Navy Corrections population in the early 1990s, the recommended analysis of the PINES includes the calculation of "alerting scores." These scores were designed to alert facility personnel about detainees/awardees that may have areas of particular need. For example, a person with a PINES score of less than 2.42 on the "Acceptance of Authority" scale should be brought to the attention of the counselors.

Although this information could be of use to the counselors, there currently is no mechanism in place for providing timely feedback. The facilities do not have the means of calculating alerting scores at their facility, and waiting for scores until Miramar can process the data requires a significant time delay. Some facilities report reviewing the detainees/awardees responses prior to sending to Miramar, but they still do not have benefit of actual scale scores.

One need is to determine if these scores could provide any additional useful information to the counselors at the facilities (through informal surveys or discussions). If these scores would add new information to the current assessment tools the counselors use, this could potentially help Navy Corrections counselors, to better target treatment programs and, hopefully, increase success.

Independent Evaluation of the Data Received from the Facilities

As described previously, there is no current means of accurately assessing the correctional facilities' compliance with the evaluation program outside their self-report. Ideally, there should be a standard means of evaluating how well facilities are complying with the evaluation plan. In this way, facilities that are not complying could be brought "back on track."

Additionally, large differential rates of responding may skew the data. For example, if a facility is not in full compliance, it may be that data are not being collected from certain persons or persons convicted of particular offenses. If that is the case, then the program evaluation is no longer representative of the entire corrections program, as specific persons or offenses were left out.

Care needs to be taken when developing these compliance measures. For example, persons detained for less than eight days should not receive the second administration of the PINES. Therefore, when compliance is calculated for the facility, persons detained for less than eight days should be subtracted from the number of brig detainees/awardees.

The number of possible compliance metrics that could be developed and implemented is potentially very large. However, there are several options that could be used to guide the selection of compliance metrics to keep the system manageable, such as:

- Selecting particular time periods to assess (such as one randomly selected month a year),

- Randomly selecting detainees/awardees to determine if the evaluation program was correctly implemented for those individuals, and/or

- Selecting only the variables of most importance (e.g., if it is decided that the PINES is the most important measure to collect, then it should be monitored).

Recidivism Numbers

Recidivism is perhaps the variable of most interest to persons involved in corrections program research, but it is also the most difficult to obtain and a variable with perhaps the largest number of possible definitions. There is no known initial documentation regarding the development of this recidivism measure. From discussions with Mr. King, it was learned that he, along with researchers from NPRDC headed by Dr. Elyse Kerce, visited the Justice Department to discuss calculating recidivism, and that there is no standard universal calculation. Other research and reports on recidivism attest to the multiple definitions (Maltz, 1984).

Using early evaluation reports as a source of documentation, it appears that the calculation of recidivism has remained consistent over time, with one small calculation error (discussed in Appendix C). In reviewing the calculations, one area of concern is the large number of cases for which the disposition is not known. Currently, it is assumed that the distribution of the disposition of those unknown cases will follow that of the known cases. Thus, if 5 percent of the

cases with known dispositions resulted in acquittals, then is it estimated that 5 percent of the cases of unknown disposition resulted in acquittal. However, the percentage of cases with a known disposition ranges from only 10 to 25 percent of all cases.

While there may be no better means of providing an estimate, the recidivism numbers deserve cautious interpretation, since a limited number of cases (those of known dispositions) are driving the calculation of overall recidivism numbers. Any systematic difference between the case dispositions of known cases and unknown cases may negatively influence the calculation of recidivism of the Navy Corrections Population.

For example, are there any known differences between dispositions that are reported to the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) and those that are not? Are convictions more or less likely to be reported to the CJIS? If convictions are more likely to be reported, then recidivism over-estimates the number of people who were convicted. Without knowing potential differences between cases with known dispositions and those with unknown dispositions, it is impossible to know how the overall recidivism number is being affected.

Another related issue is the amount of time required for this analysis. Since the data from the CJIS cannot be sent electronically, the data must be hand-entered, a very time consuming process, prone to human errors. There are some alternatives to a yearly assessment of recidivism. One alternative is to conduct the analysis, every 2 or every 3 years. This would allow for tracking of recidivism rates, yet would reduce the volume of work required. More advanced analysis of the available data could be conducted in the intervening years. One drawback to this approach is that it would not track data on a yearly basis and not all individuals would be tracked. However, as long as the group of released inmates did not differ significantly from year to year (e.g., the characteristics of the group of persons released each year were approximately equal), then a non-yearly assessment would likely provide adequate information.

Another approach is to take a sample of those released (yearly or every two years, etc.) and determine if they were re-arrested. As long as the sample selected was random then we would expect it to be representative of all persons released that year within a margin of error that could be calculated based on the size of the sample and population. One potential complication is that the percentage of individuals with a known case disposition is relatively low. Taking a sample of that population would decrease the absolute number of individuals for whom case disposition is known, yet it is that number that drives the majority of the calculation.

A tangentially related topic to recidivism is the presentation of the additional calculations in the "Follow-up of Discharged Offenders." This is typically presented by Mr. King as follow-on analysis to the recidivism calculations and looks at features such as differences in program ratings by non-re-arrestees and re-arrestees. Unfortunately, Mr. King reported that he did not keep the specific statistical syntax files from which most of these analyses were run, nor did he have the output files. This again highlights the need to keep the syntax and output files of analysis, as discussed previously.

One calculation that was discussed in detail was the comparison of total program hours for those who relapse and those who do not. That comparison is currently based on the sum of participation hours, rather than the average participation hours. Since the number of persons who do not relapse, or commit another crime, is so much larger than the numbers who relapse, the summation of total program participation hours of those who do not relapse is naturally much larger than the sum of the total program participation hours of those who do relapse. It is

important that the analysis is not adversely affected by the large difference between the size of the two groups being compared Therefore, the analysis should focus on the average number of program participation hours per individual and not the absolute total number of hours. Since syntax files of the other specific analyses were not maintained, it is impossible to discover if there are any additional analysis problems.

Reporting of Analyses

One of the important factors in the reporting of research is the ability to replicate the methods, procedures, and results that others have used. Of critical importance in the ability to replicate research is the clear reporting of the research—the subject, the variable, the methods, and the type of analysis. In some corrections program reports, the parameters of research are not clear. For example, in several reports of CCU success, one measure used is type of discharge. What is unclear is if the measurement periods—the time between release and measurement (i.e., assessment of discharge status)—are equivalent for all subjects across reports. For example, in the August 2002 report, the discharge status of CCU detainees from 1999 and 2000 was assessed. The report is not clear, but it appears that detainees from both years were assessed in 2002. Therefore, those released in 1999 were assessed over 3 years, whereas those assessed in 2000 were only assessed for 2 years. If these assessments were based on different numbers of years, then the results are not directly comparable.

Further Exploratory Analysis

The Program Evaluation Handbook lays out some very specific processes to follow, particularly regarding how to best clean and manage the data. Such guidelines are very useful, given the large volume of data this evaluation produces and the complex nature of the data (i.e., multiple administrations of the same form at different times, multiple raters at a single time, etc.).

The Handbook also provides suggestions regarding further in-depth research, where data from multiple forms are used together to find complex relationships and patterns (e.g., do persons who report discord in the home (as reported on the Life History Form) show greater or fewer behavior changes (as assessed in the Pre-release questionnaire) than those who report no discord in the home?). There is a multitude of complex relationships that could be investigated and because the research question of interest at a particular time may change over time, the Handbook does not provide specific guidance (i.e., the actual syntax that is to be run), but general guidance.

This is a potentially rich source of information that currently appears to be underutilized. There are special limitations and considerations that must be made in conducting such analyses, but they may provide some very useful information in further understanding the population and potentially differential effects based on treatment of the population.

Additionally, in prioritizing which analyses to pursue, it is often wise not to analyze everything at once. Such in-depth analyses are often conducted at regular time intervals (e.g., every 2 years, every 5 years, etc.) and may even alternate with other analyses. These types of analyses require much time and preparation, and the value of the information they yield needs to be considered against the time and cost of the analysis.

Another area of analysis that is suggested in the Evaluation Handbook is continued analysis of the psychometric properties of the scales used. For example, there is a need to evaluate the scales' reliability (i.e., does it consistently assess) and validity (i.e., does it assess what it was intended to assess). The Responsible Service Member scale collects data from multiple raters and the data could be used to determine how similar or different the ratings are and if ratings from one group of raters (such as the counselors) are more useful (better predicts) than the other. If so, perhaps dual ratings at each administration are not necessary. Like the exploratory analysis described above, these analyses do not necessarily need to be conducted yearly, but need to be included in an overall evaluation plan.

Practical versus Statistical Significance

One issue of particular importance in evaluating data from this program evaluation is the difference between statistical significance and practical significance. Statistical significance is a tool used by researchers to assess whether differences in scores are likely due to chance or due to some other factor, presumably the intervention, provided certain conditions are met (e.g., random sampling, random assignment, holding extraneous factors constant). A finding of statistically significant differences, though, is not the final piece of information on which all conclusions are drawn, but rather is one piece of many that should be utilized.

One interesting feature in the calculation of statistics is that sample size can have a large impact on the findings of statistical significance. Stated another way, it is not uncommon to find significant differences between two very large groups, although the absolute difference is very small.

For example, in King (2002), there appear to be significant differences between the first and second administration of the PINES on all scales (pg. 7). However, upon closer inspection, we see that these scores are not very different in absolute magnitude. For example, the "Acceptance of Authority" scale shows a mean value of 2.86 for the first administration and a mean value of 2.87 for the second administration, with significance at p <0.0001. On first inspection, the significant result may appear to be promising. But a finding of significance does not indicate the degree of importance. The real question is does a 0.01 increase have a practical meaning; does that difference indicate any real difference? In most cases, on a 5-point scale, an increase of that small a magnitude would not indicate overwhelming success. However, it may be decided that such an improvement, although small, is meaningful. Those are decisions that have to be made irrespective of the statistical significance.[2]

Multiple Records

One difficulty in any program evaluation is when a single person has the potential of being involved with the program at multiple facilities. Such is the issue with the Navy Corrections Program given the current structure of the system. An individual may enter a facility as a pre-trial confinement detainee, and then, upon being found guilty, be transferred to a different

---

[2] The issue of practical versus statistical significance has also been discussed in the context of evaluating organizational diversity programs. According to Rosenfeld, Landis, and Dalsky (2003), statistical significance implies only that the difference between two numbers is non-zero, not that it has any organizational importance. To determine whether an obtained statistical difference has practical significance requires a judgment that the difference is substantial and that it occurs in multiple evaluation sources rather than just one.

facility. Conversely, one individual may spend his/her pre-trial confinement and prison term at the same facility.

A potential complication is that multiple records may be kept on one individual and not on another. Decision rules need to be set about how to handle multiple records from one individual. For example, for someone who moves from a pre-trial confinement facility at Great Lakes to the Navy Consolidated Brig at Miramar, should the first PINES for that individual reflect the initial entry at Great Lakes or the entry at Miramar? One correctional facility reported if someone re-enters their facility within 30 days, even if for a different offense, they do not re-administer all of the entry forms (such as the PINES and Life History Form). Staff at that facility does not expect any significant changes from an individual within 30 days; therefore, they do not believe re-administering the form is useful. This, however, does not appear to occur at all facilities.

There are several options that may be considered in mitigating this problem. One is to consider if these evaluation data need to be captured at facilities that serve almost exclusively as pre-trial confinement facilities. Detainees remain at these facilities for such a short time period, and there is not likely to be any follow-on data collected. Even if follow-on data were collected, there would be no expected change since the period of confinement would be so small and typically these pre-trial facilities do not have treatment or educational programs.

An additional consideration is the implementation of a tracking system that does not use the individual's Social Security Number (SSN), but rather some other number to refer to the incident for which the individual is incarcerated. Use of such an "incidence number" would allow for better connecting of all of an individual's data. For example, an individual may enter a pre-trial facility and be subsequently released (with no prison term), and then re-enter for a different offence, be found guilty and sent to another facility to serve his/her term. In tracking change for that individual, it would be best to use information from the measures (such as the PINES) from the second admission in evaluating the program, especially when evaluating change scores (such as the change in PINES). Without the incidence number, one would have to look at dates of confinement to guess which data are most appropriate to track. Incidence numbers would reduce time, resources, and human error.

Discussion and Recommendations

Overall, the consistency of reported evaluation activities with the original plan is considerable. For the most part, staff at the different correctional facilities seemed very familiar with the evaluation activities and could, without hesitation, provide information about the different scales and measures (with the Corrections Staff Data Questionnaire being the major exception). Further, analysis of the evaluation data appears to follow the original plan. Of course, independent verification of their self-reported compliance with evaluation activities would be beneficial.

Regarding major areas for future improvement, the following recommendations are made:

- Establish performance standards to be used in conjunction with statistical evaluation of data.

  Currently, programs are considered successful if evaluation data shows statistically significant results. However, given such a large population of individuals included in the evaluation, the likelihood of finding statistically significant results is increased simply because of the large sample size. As a result, changes in scale scores of one-tenth of a point on a 5-point scale are often statistically significant. However, one must question if such a small absolute change is practically significant. One means of dealing with this concern is to focus more on the numbers and less on the level of statistical significance. It would be wise to set goals for many of the measures, for example, specifying the amount of change desired (i.e., "A one point increase in external locus of control") or absolute values (i.e., "A pre-release score of 3.5 on the locus of control scale"). Either way, they would provide a gauge or reference point and would reduce reliance solely on findings of statistical significance.

- Clarification of participation rules and standards.

  Any evaluation needs clear guidelines for participation and these needs are magnified for evaluation programs that occur at multiple, geographically distant locations. For example, do facilities that are strictly pre-trial confinement facilities need to participate? Should the evaluation really look at only those individuals who are incarcerated for greater than 90 days and are at a facility capable of providing a treatment program? Specifying such decision rules helps to ensure that data from the various locations are compatible and reduces any unnecessary sources of error.

- Maintain thorough documentation of all raw data and analysis procedures.

  Finally, one critical element to any evaluation is the ability to replicate the evaluation and analysis and verify the results. This is accomplished by consistent and thorough documentation of the data used, the analyses conducted, and the output. In addition to be a good standard research practice, this generally makes future repeated analysis easier and more efficient, since the procedures and/or syntax have been documented. It also provides consistency over time allowing for comparisons across years.

In conclusion, the degree to which current evaluation practices follow the original evaluation program as established over ten years ago is remarkable. Incorporating these recommendations would serve to facilitate the slight course corrections that need to be made. They would also ensure that the data currently being gathered are collected in the most efficient and beneficial manner.

References

Kerce, E. W. (1989). *Navy Corrections Program Evaluation: Volume I. Design* (NPRDC-TR-89-17). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Kerce, E. W., & Magnusson, P. (1992). *The Effects of Retraining Interventions on Individuals Confined in Navy Correctional Facilities* (NPRDC-TN-92-18). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Kerce, E. W., Magnusson, P., & Rudolph, A. (1994) *The Attitudes of Navy Corrections Staff Members: What They Think About Confinees and Their Jobs* (NPRDC-TR-94-7). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

King, C. L. (2000, November). Prisoner's opportunities for success. Paper presented at the 2000 Navy Brig Officer's Conference.

King, C. L. (2002, May). Prisoner's opportunities for level II success. Paper presented at the 2002 Navy Brig Officer's Conference.

King, C. L & Sheposh, J. (1997). Navy corrections program evaluation. Paper presented at the 1997 Brig Officer's Conference.

Maltz, M. D. ([1984] 2001). *Recidivism*. Originally published by Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, Florida. Internet edition available at http://www.uic.edu/depts/lib/forr/pdf/crimjust/recidivism.pdf

Rosenfeld, P., Landis, D., & Dalsky, D. (2003) Evaluating diversity programs. In J.E. Edwards, J.C. Scott, and N. S. Raju (Eds). The human resources program-evaluation handbook. (pp. 343-362). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Appendix A
Interview Guide

GENERAL BACKGROUND

1. What is the total capacity in the Pre-trial confinement facility?

2. What is the total capacity in the CCU?

3. Typically, how many do you have at any given time in the Pre-trial confinement facility?

4. Typically, how many do you have at any given time in the CCU?

PINES

5. Is the PINES administered at your facility?

6. When is the first PINES form administered (during in-doc, during orientation, etc.); please indicate how long after arrival it is administered.

   6a. Do they (detainees and awardees) complete it in a one-on-one session with counselors, in a group orientation setting, or how?

   6b. What happens to the form after it is completed by the detainee/awardee (is a copy made for files, is it kept at your facility, is it sent to Miramar, etc.)?

7. Is a second PINES administered?

   7a. When is it administered?

   7b. Who administers it? (Positions titles are fine, such as "counselor" or "quarter supervisor")

   7c. Is it completed by both detainees in the Pre-trial confinement facility and awardees to the CCU?

   7d. Do they (detainees and awardees) complete it in a one-on-one session with counselors, in a group orientation setting, or how?

   7e. What happens to the form after it is completed by the detainee/awardee (is a copy made for files, is it kept at your facility, is it sent to Miramar, etc.)?

8. If these forms are sent to Miramar, does anyone review them before they are sent out for completeness (for example, does anyone check to see if the location is filled out correctly, that dates are correct, etc.)?

LIFE HISTORY FORM

9. Is the Life History Form administered at your facility?

10. When is the first Life History Form administered (during in-doc, during orientation, etc.); please include how long after arrival it is administered.

   10a. Do they (detainees and awardees) complete it in a one-on-one session with counselors, in a group orientation setting, or how?

   10b. What happens to the form after it is completed by the detainee/awardee (is a copy made for files, is it kept at your facility, is it sent to Miramar, etc.)?

11. If this form is sent to Miramar, does anyone review them before they are sent out for completeness (for example, does anyone check to see if the location is filled out correctly, that dates are correct, etc.)?

RESPONSIBLE SERVICE MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

12. Is the Responsible Service Member (RSM) Questionnaire completed at your facility?

13. When is the first RSM completed on each detainee and/or awardee?

    13a. Who (and how many) completes this first RSM (position titles are fine, such as "counselor" or "quarter supervisor")?

    13b. Is this form being completed on paper or on-line in CORMIS?

    13c. If this form is completed on paper, what is done with this form?

    13d. If more than one Brig Staff is completing this form, are they completing it at the same time or do they complete it separately?

14. Is a second RSM completed for each detainee and/or awardee at your facility?

    14a. When is the second RSM completed on each detainee and/or awardee?

    14b. Who (and how many) completes this second RSM (position titles are fine, such as "counselor" or "quarter supervisor")?

    14c. Is this form being completed on paper or on-line in CORMIS?

    14d. If this form is completed on paper, what is done with this form?

    14e. If more than one Brig Staff is completing this form, are they completing it at the same time or do they complete it separately?

15. Is a third RSM completed for each detainee and/or awardee at your facility?

    15a. When is the third RSM completed on each detainee and/or awardee?

    15b. Who (and how many) completes this first RSM (position titles are fine, such as "counselor" or "quarter supervisor")?

    15c. Is this form being completed on paper or on-line in CORMIS?

    15d. If this form is completed on paper, what is done with this form?

    15e. If more than one Brig Staff is completing this form, are they completing it at the same time or do they complete it separately?

PRE-RELEASE QUESTIONNAIRE

16. Is the Pre-release Questionnaire completed at your facility?

17. How far in advance of release is it completed?

18. Who administers this form?

19. What is done with this form after it is completed?

PROGRAM SUMMARY FORM

20. Is the Program Summary Form completed at your facility?

21. Who completes this form?

22. When is this form completed?

23. What is done with this form after it is completed?

CORRECTIONS STAFF DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

24. Is the Corrections Staff Data Questionnaire completed at your facility?

25. When is this form administered?

26. Who completes this questionnaire (position titles)?

27. What is done with this form after it is completed?

CCU

28. After an awardee is released from the CCU, are there any follow-up activities (such as a letter to his/her command asking about performance, etc.)?

    28a. What are those activities?

    28b. What is done with that information?

29. If there are any differences in how this evaluation program is handled for awardees to the CCU that were not addressed in the above questions, please provide that information here.

GENERAL THOUGHTS and COMMENTS

30. If there are any other concerns, issues, or special features of the evaluation system at your facility that the above questions did not address, but are important to understanding what happens at your facility, please provide that information here.

31. If you have any comments, suggestions, or ideas about the evaluation systems please provide them here.

Appendix B
Table of Results by Correctional Facility

	PINES1	PINES2	Life History Form	RSM1	RSM2	RSM3
Pre-Trial Confinement Great Lakes	Yes - when they first arrive	Given if detainee remains longer than 10 days	Yes - when they first arrive; given with PINES1; are NOT KEPT	Yes - Section leader and counselor complete when detainee first arrives; some still use paper and is then put into CORMIS	Yes - given when detainee moves out of orientation; completed by new section leader and same counselor as previous	Yes - completed by the Section Leader and Counselor
Pre-Trial Confinement Groton, CT	Yes - when they first arrive	Yes & No - they often miss their detainees before they leave; and if transferred, it is not completed	Yes - when they first arrive; given with PINES1; are NOT KEPT	Yes - Completed in first 3 days; completed by Quarter Supervisor and Brig Duty Officer; NOT in CORMIS and NOT sent to Miramar	Yes - completed within 10 days after they move to the general population; completed by same people; NOT in CORMIS and NOT sent to Miramar	Yes - completed 5 days before release by same people; NOT completed for those transferred to a Brig; NOT in CORMIS and NOT sent to Miramar
Pensacola Brig	Yes - completed during orientation	Tes – completed prior to release; administered by counselor	Yes - completed during orientation; not retaining copies	Yes - completed within first 5 days by Counselor and Brig Duty Officer (BDO) ; BDO completes on paper and Counselor inputs into CORMIS	Yes - when released to housing unit; completed by Dorm Supervisor and Counselor; Counselor puts both into CORMIS	Yes - during outprocessing; Housing Staff member and counselor; Counselor inputs into CORMIS
Pensacola CCU	No	No	No	No	No	No
Puget Sound Brig	Yes - during in-doc (within 3 days)	5 days prior to release	Yes - TWICE; once in receiving and then 8 days after in-doc	Yes - Counselor and Command Duty Officer (CDO) completed within first 72 hours; PAPER ONLY	Yes - completed 5 days later by same personnel as RSM1; PAPER ONLY	No in interview; changed to Yes on follow-up
Puget Sound CCU	Yes - during in-doc (within 24 hours)	5 days prior to release	Yes - TWICE; once in receiving and then 8 days after in-doc	Yes - Counselor and Command Duty Officer (CDO) completed within first 72 hours; PAPER ONLY	Yes - completed 5 days later by same personnel as RSM1; PAPER ONLY	No in interview; changed to Yes on follow-up

	PINES1	PINES2	Life History Form	RSM1	RSM2	RSM3
Charleston Brig	Completed in Orientation	Yes - at release	Completed by Case Manager in housing unit; not sure if copy placed in file	YES – completed by Case Manager; Quarter Supervisor, or LCPO during orientation; In CORMIS	Yes - when they move to the housing unit, in CORMIS	Yes - prior to release, in CORMIS
Jacksonville Brig	Yes - as part of check-in	Yes - at release	Yes - as part of check-in	Yes - completed within first 24 - 72 hours by Guard Staff and Counselor; in CORMIS	Yes - completed by same persons within first 15 days; in CORMIS	Yes - completed by same persons 5 days to a week prior to release; in CORMIS
Jacksonville CCU	Yes - as part of check-in	Yes - at release	Yes - as part of check-in	Yes - completed within first 24 - 72 hours by Guard Staff and Counselor; in CORMIS	Yes - completed by same persons within first 15 days; in CORMIS	Yes - completed by same persons 5 days to a week prior to release; in CORMIS
Norfolk Brig	Yes - during orientation; form is copied and placed in file	Yes - at pre-release; copies placed in files	Yes - during orientation; form is copied and placed in file	Yes - completed by the Receiving and Orientation (R&O) supervisor and Block Supervisor (on paper); R&O only puts ONE FORM IN CORMIS	Yes - completed when move to general population by two counselors; counselors come to consensus and enter only one RSM	Yes - completed a week prior to departure by counselors; R&O only puts ONE FORM IN CORMIS
Norfolk CCU	Yes - during orientation; form is copied and placed in file	Yes - at pre-release; copies placed in files	Yes - during orientation; form is copied and placed in file	Yes - completed by the Counselor and Dorm Supervisor (on paper); only ONE IN CORMIS	Yes - completed at 21 day review by two counselors; counselors come to consensus and enter only one RSM	Yes - completed a week after 21 day review (typically when release occurs) ; R&O only puts ONE FORM IN CORMIS
Yokosuka - Brig	Yes - during In-doc	Yes - day before release	Yes - during In-doc; booklet is kept but form is sent to Miramar	Yes - during orientation by Quarter supervisors; paper forms and put in CORMIS	Yes - when they move to housing; paper forms and put in CORMIS	Yes - prior to release; paper forms and put in CORMIS

	PINES1	PINES2	Life History Form	RSM1	RSM2	RSM3
Yokosuka - CCU	Yes - during In-doc	Yes - day before release	Yes - during In-doc; booklet is kept but form is sent to Miramar	Yes - during orientation by Quarter supervisors; paper forms and put in CORMIS	Yes - when they move to housing; paper forms and put in CORMIS	Yes - prior to release; paper forms and put in CORMIS
Pearl Harbor - Brig	Yes - during Indoc (PINES Form A and B)	Yes - during Indoc; (PINES Form A and B) AND just prior to release	Yes - during in-doc; is copied for file and also sent to Miramar	Yes - completed by 2 Counselors in CORMIS within 72 hours	Yes - completed by 2 Counselors in CORMIS 10 days after arrival	Yes - completed prior to release by the same two counselors as before
Pearl Harbor - CCU	Yes- during Indoc (PINES Form A and B)	Yes - during Indoc; (PINES Form A and B) AND just prior to release	Yes - during in-doc; is copied for file and also sent to Miramar	Yes - completed by 2 Counselors in CORMIS within 72 hours	Yes - completed by 2 Counselors in CORMIS 10 days after arrival	Yes - completed prior to release by the same two counselors as before
Guantanamo Bay	No experience with program					

	Pre-release Questionnaire	Program Summary	Corrections Staff Data Questionnaire	Comments	Other or Added Elements
Pre-Trial Confinement Great Lakes	Given if detainee remains longer than 10 days	No	No		
Pre-Trial Confinement Groton, CT	Yes and No – no consistent pattern of administration	No	No		
Pensacola Brig	Yes	Yes - completed by counselors	Yes		
Pensacola CCU	No	No	Yes		Receive a letter from commands on awardees performance post release
Puget Sound Brig	No	Yes - completed by Brig Staff (Training Officer)	Yes - TWICE; when they report and when they leave (if they catch them)	Changed information on how often RSM is completed	
Puget Sound CCU	No	Yes	Yes - TWICE; when they report and when they leave (if they catch them)	Changed information on how RSM is completed on follow-up	There is a command follow-up
Charleston Brig	Yes - at release	Yes - completed by detainees	No	Changed information on how RSM is completed on follow-up	
Jacksonville Brig	Only given to adjudged prisoners	Completed (but would like more detail on the form); completed by counselor	Yes		

	Pre-release Questionnaire	Program Summary	Corrections Staff Data Questionnaire	Comments	Other or Added Elements
Jacksonville CCU	Only given to adjudged prisoners	Completed (but would like more detail on the form); completed by counselor	Yes		
Norfolk Brig	Yes - at pre-release; copies placed in files	Yes – completed by counselors; copies placed in files	Only when staff enters; not completed when staff leaves	Detainees may or may not get final forms (PINES2, RSM3, & Pre-release questionnaire); RE: RSM; originally completing separately, but the Block supervisor would just mark everything 4 or 5; so process was changed to where the counselor "manages" the process of setting scores.	Their general rule is that if someone is returning within 30 days, they do not start the data collection process over.
Norfolk CCU	Yes - at pre-release; copies placed in files	Yes – completed by counselors; copies placed in files	Yes	Was not sure if command follow-up was being conducted	·
Yokosuka - Brig	Yes - day before release	Completed by counselor after release	Yes - given to staff member prior to transfer		
Yokosuka - CCU	Yes - day before release	Completed by counselor after release	Yes	NO follow-up for CCU awardees	

	Pre-release Questionnaire	Program Summary	Corrections Staff Data Questionnaire	Comments	Other or Added Elements
Pearl Harbor - Brig	Yes - Prior to release	Yes - completed by the counselors just prior or just after release	No	Double-checked and confirmed that the PINES form A and B are both being completed during in-doc	
Pearl Harbor - CCU	Yes - Prior to release	Yes - completed by the counselors just prior or just after release	No		
Guantanamo Bay	No experience with program				

Appendix C
Explanation of Calculation Error in Recidivism Calculation

Recidivism Numbers

This section explains the slight deviation in calculation of the recidivism numbers. It should first be noted that there does NOT appear to be an error in the "final" recidivism number—that is, the estimate of the number of people convicted of a crime after their release from a Navy correctional facility. Rather, this is a relatively minor error in the presentation of initial data, en route to the calculation.

As there is no single source of documentation regarding this calculation, recent calculations have been compared to past calculations. The difference in calculation appears in the presentation of the number of arrests. For example, from King and Sheposh (1997), we see the following:

Number of Arrests:	N	Percent
None	3984	75%
One	1345	25%
Two	661	12.2%
Three	332	6.2%
Four	187	3.5%
Five	106	1.9%
Six or more	45	.84%

As explained by King (personal communication, June 25, 2002), the line "One" actually represents "One or more arrests," such that those listed under the following rows are included in the row "One." Additionally, an earlier slide in the presentation reports, "In 1990 – 25% (1,345) of the 5,329 individuals in the sample had a record of at least one arrest," which reiterates King's explanation. Perhaps a clearer way of presenting the data would be:

Number of Arrests:	N	Percent
None	3984	75%
One or more	1345	25%
Two	*661*	*12.2%*
Three	*332*	*6.2%*
Four	*187*	*3.5%*
Five	*106*	*1.9%*
Six or more	*45*	*.84%*

In this way, the total number of **individuals** ("N") arrested (any number of times) was 1,345, of which 661 were re-arrested twice, 332 were individuals re-arrested three times, etc. To determine the number of persons only arrested once, one would take the number of "One or more" (1345) and subtract all of those with multiple arrests (1,345 – 661-332-187-106-45 = 14).

However, in an earlier slide, it was reported, "49% of those arrested were arrested more than one time." This percentage cannot be calculated from this table, because 1,331 (the sum of "Two" through "Six or more") is 98.95% of 1,345, the "One or more" total. So, the data presented in this table is not consistent.

What appears to be happening is that this table is attempting to present both person counts ("N" = the number of individuals) and arrest counts. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that

if you add "One or more" through "Six or more," the total is 2,676. On an earlier slide in the presentation, this is reported to be the total number of **arrests**, however, since some were arrested more than once, that would not represent number of people. That does not clear up all of the confusion, though. For example, it is reported that there are 661 "Two" arrests. Following this calculation, these 661 arrests would have been committed by 330.5 (661/2) people—which is an impossibility.

In King (2000), we see similar data:

Number of Arrests:	N	Percent:
None	3579	78%
One	1038	22%
Two	591	12.8%
Three	342	7.4%
Four	204	4.4%
Five	117	2.5%
Six or more	50	1%

Reformatting for easier reading, as above, would provide:

Number of Arrests:	N	Percent:
None	3579	78%
One or more	1038	22%
Two	*591*	*12.8%*
Three	*342*	*7.4%*
Four	*204*	*4.4%*
Five	*117*	*2.5%*
Six or more	*50*	*1%*

However, the above data does not follow the original guidelines because the sum of "Two" through "Six or more" (591+342+204+117+50) equals 1,304, which would mean only four (4) individuals were arrested once. An earlier slide in the presentation indicated that 1,038 individuals had at least one arrest, which corresponds with the "One or more" line above.

An earlier slide also indicated that "57% of those rearrested were arrested more than one time." However, according to the data as it was explained, 99.7% (1304/1308) were arrested more than once. It again seems that there is a "mixture" of reporting **number of individuals** arrested/rearrested and **number of arrests**. Again, an earlier slide in the presentation indicates "totaling 2,342 arrests for these individuals," which corresponds to the sum of the lines "One or more" through "Six or more." This would indicate that the "N" refers to number of arrests. However, even that data is unclear. If there were 591 "Two arrests," then it would appear that these 591 arrests happened to 295.5 (591/2) persons, which cannot happen.

Again, the critical element is that this does not initially appear to detrimentally affect the final recidivism number (although it is important to remember the limitations in estimating recidivism that were discussed above). That acknowledged, clearer presentation of the data is needed.

Distribution List

AIR UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
AIRFORCE ARMSTRONG LABORATORY (CODE 13)
ARMY MANAGEMENT STAFF COLLEGE LIBRARY
ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE LIBRARY
ARMY WAR COLLEGE LIBRARY
CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES LIBRARY
CORRECTIONS AND PROGRAM DIVISION (PERS-68)
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTORATE TECHNICAL LIBRARY
JOINT FORCES STAFF COLLEGE LIBRARY
MARINE CORPS UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
NAVAL HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER WILKINS BIOMEDICAL LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY RUTH HOOKER RESEARCH LIBRARY
NAVAL WAR COLLEGE LIBRARY
PENTAGON LIBRARY
USAF ACADEMY LIBRARY
US COAST GUARD ACADEMY LIBRARY
US MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY BLAND LIBRARY
US MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT LIBRARY
US NAVAL ACADEMY NIMITZ LIBRARY